

- make it a high priority to identify and assess environmental health risks and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children
- ensure that their policies, programs, activities, and standards address disproportionate risks to children that result from environmental health risks or safety risks.

6.15 Chemical Management

Chemical management would be conducted according to DOE Order 5480.4, *Environmental Protection, Safety, and Health Protection Standards* (DOE 1993a), which requires DOE and its contractors to comply with National Fire Protection Association Codes and Standards and the Occupational Safety and Health Standards in 29 CFR 1910. The Hanford strategy for chemical management is described in Section 2.2.3 of the *Hanford Site Environmental Report for Calendar Year 2001* (Poston et al. 2002).

6.16 Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know

Part 5 of Executive Order 13148, “Greening the Government Through Leadership in Environmental Management,” (65 FR 14595) requires that federal executive branch agencies comply with the requirements for toxic chemical release reporting in Section 313 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act (42 USC 11001). DOE’s compliance with the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act at the Hanford Site is discussed in Section 2.2.5 of the *Hanford Site Environmental Report for Calendar Year 2001* (Poston et al. 2002). Compliance activities would be supplemented with any additional notification, planning, or reporting requirements that may arise.

6.17 Pollution Prevention

Part 5 of Executive Order 13148, “Greening the Government Through Leadership in Environmental Management,” (65 FR 14595) requires that federal executive branch agencies comply with Section 6607 of the Pollution Prevention Act (42 USC 13101 et seq.). Section 6607 requires that owners of a facility required to file an annual toxic chemical release form under Section 313 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act (42 USC 11001) for any toxic chemical shall include with each such annual filing a toxic-chemical source reduction and recycling report for the preceding calendar year. DOE’s compliance with the Pollution Prevention Act at the Hanford Site is discussed in Section 2.2.5 of the *Hanford Site Environmental Report for Calendar Year 2001* (Poston et al. 2002). If implementation of any alternative considered in this EIS were to trigger reporting under Section 313 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act, DOE would comply with the reporting requirements and the requirement for a toxic-chemical source reduction and recycling report.

6.18 Endangered Species

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (16 USC 1536) requires that Federal agencies 1) use their authority in furtherance of the purposes of the act by carrying out programs for the conservation of listed

endangered and threatened species, and 2) consult with appropriate Federal agencies to ensure that any action carried out by DOE is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat for such species. Additional information is provided in Sections 4.6.4 and 5.5.12 of this HSW EIS and in Section 2.2.12 of the *Hanford Site Environmental Report 2001* (Poston et al. 2002).

6.19 Permit Requirements

The CEQ regulations implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1502.25[b]) require that a draft EIS list all federal permits, licenses, and other entitlements that must be obtained to implement the alternatives.

The principal existing Hanford facilities that would be involved in implementing the alternatives in the HSW EIS are the Central Waste Complex, 200 Area Effluent Treatment Facility (ETF), Liquid Effluent Retention Facility, LLW Trenches, MLLW Trenches, T Plant Complex, and the Waste Receiving and Processing Facility. Table 6.1 indicates whether operation of each of these facilities is covered in the existing Dangerous Waste portion of the Hanford RCRA permit (Ecology 2001a), the Hanford Air Operating Permit (Ecology 2001b), or the Hanford Waste Discharge Permit (DOE 2002a). In all cases where units are covered in the Dangerous Waste portion of the Hanford RCRA permit, the coverage is in Part III of the permit that contains unit-specific conditions for final status operations. The MLLW trenches and T Plant Complex are being incorporated into the Dangerous Waste portion of the Hanford RCRA permit (DOE 2002a).

Table 6.1. Coverage of Hanford Solid Waste Management Units in Existing Permits

Unit	Dangerous Waste Portion of Hanford RCRA Permit	Hanford Air Operating Permit	Hanford State Waste Discharge Permit
Central Waste Complex	Yes	Yes	No
200 Area ETF	Yes	Yes	Yes
Liquid Effluent Retention Facility	Yes	Yes	No
LLW Trenches	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
MLLW Trenches	Yes ^(a)	Yes	No
T Plant Complex	Yes ^(a)	Yes	No
Waste Receiving and Processing Facility	Yes	Yes	No
(a) Interim status currently, final status in process.			

DOE would obtain appropriate required permits for any new or modified facility. For example, a new waste processing facility would require a variety of approvals, permits, or permit modifications, including a modification to the dangerous waste portion of the Hanford RCRA permit, submission of a notice of construction to the WDOH, modification of the Hanford Air Operating Permit, construction approval by EPA under 40 CFR 61, and/or approval from EPA under TSCA and the regulations in 40 CFR 761(d), if waste containing PCBs is treated or disposed of at the facility. Permits might be required for operating pulse driers to process leachate. New immobilized low-activity waste (ILAW) trenches could also require